

and said: "You think I am aiming at the king. No; I am simply describing the devil."

In 1828, while preaching at Fall River, the invitation came for him to go to Boston and take charge of the Seamen's Bethel. That was the place he needed. He soon became one of the foremost pulpit orators of the day. He filled Webster's idea of an orator. "Eloquence," said Webster, does not count in words; it counts in the man, in the subject, and the occasion." He filled Cicero's idea of an orator: "He thundered, he lightened, he overthrew and bore down all before him by the irresistible tide of his eloquence."

This was his prayer for President Lincoln: "Lord, guide our dear President, our Abraham, the friend of God, like the old Abraham. Save him from those wriggling, piercing, slimy, boring, keel-worms. Don't let them go through the sheathing of his integrity." Who says God did not hear his prayer?

A noted Unitarian minister once pushed his way into his study after he had given orders to admit no one. He spent a couple of pleasant hours with Father Taylor, and on going away, said: "You left orders not to let in even St. Paul, and here I have spent two delightful hours with you." Quick as a flash Father Taylor said: "Certainly, Brother; I expect to spend a blessed eternity with St. Paul, but when you and I part on earth it is good-bye forever."

He was a great patriot as well as preacher. At a meeting at Niagara Falls he said: "After you have seen Niagara, all that you may say is an echo; it remains Niagara and will roll and tumble and foam and play and sport till the last trumpet shall sound. It will remain Niagara whether you are friends or foes. So with this country. It is the greatest God ever gave to man, for Adam never had the enjoyment of it, and if he had he could not have managed it. It is OUR OWN. God reserved it for us and there is not the shadow of it in all the world beside."

When told that Emerson would go to hell, he replied: "Then he will modify the atmosphere."

To Dr. Channing he said: "When you die, angels will fight for the glory of carrying you to heaven on their shoulders."

Walt Whitman said of him: "I never had anything in the way of vocal utterance to shake me through and through and become fixed with its accompaniments in my memory like those prayers and sermons of Father Taylor."

He died in 1868.

General Lawton.

Because of the multitude of events of importance on Memorial day, not enough attention was given the fact that on that day a statue of General Henry W. Lawton was unveiled in Indianapolis, for among generals, General Lawton was only in the second rank; among heroes he stood in the very front rank. A picture of the American volunteer soldier never could have a juster model than that of General Lawton. He was such a soldier as was General Robert McCook; as General Miles was twenty years ago; a soldier by instinct, one who in a savage tribe would have been chief of the tribe by natural selection. And he was a patriot through and through; with him it was his country all the time. Like Lyon, who died at Wilson Creek, he felt that all he was came of his country; all that he could offer, including his life, was not too much for native land. He faced the fiercest battles of the great Civil war; it was pitiable that he should finally fall by the shot of a mongrel in a jungle of the Philippines; but his was a soldier's death on the battlefield, and was his crowning act of devotion.

We are glad that the men of his State have made for him an imperishable statue to be his monument. To see it will be a good thing for the children of that State. When grown up, if there is a call for volunteers, the memory of that statue

will be an incentive for them to imitate his example. Wherever such monuments are upreared they make a sacred spot; they make the State in which they stand more worthy of defense, and the impression made upon the hearts of children who look upon them will, in later years, when a trial comes, make it impossible for them to fail to meet their duty.

Again San Francisco and the Japs.

Secretary Root always makes the clearest showing of what a law or treaty means of any man in Washington.

On the subject of the Japanese and the San Francisco school question he maintains his reputation. He quotes from the Constitution of 1787 as follows:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Then after stating that California was not bound to establish schools for foreigners or for her own people, for that matter, but that "if any State chooses to extend privileges to alien residents as well as to citizen residents, the State will be forbidden by the application of the treaty, to discriminate against the resident citizens of the particular country with which the treaty is made, and will be forbidden to deny to them the privileges which it grants to the citizens of other foreign countries."

The foregoing on its face is certainly conclusive. But we imagine Secretary Root on the supreme bench of the United States, with that statement of the case laid before him, and we think we can imagine what his decision would be, and think it would be something like this:

"This is a question that was not considered when the treaty with Japan was framed, but it has a direct application. If San Francisco supplies schools to alien residents, German or French or English or Irish or any other nationality, she is bound to supply the children of Japanese residents with schools in equally as good school houses and with equally competent teachers. When this is done, her responsibility under the treaty is finished. The regulations which govern the school rooms of San Francisco are the exclusive province of the people there; they are a right which, unless they be treasonable, neither the Constitution of the United States nor any treaty made under it can in any way interfere. The complaint in this case is a foundationless as though it had been that, out of a family in San Francisco one daughter had married a German, another an Englishman, both with the father's approval, but that in forbidding the third daughter to marry a Japanese it was a violation of the treaty between the United States and the Japanese, because that treaty guarantees to Japan all the privileges extended to the most favored nations."

That at least is the real status of the case. The Japanese are admitted without question to the high schools and universities of California. That the authorities there recoiled before the proposition to have their little children occupy the same seats with Japanese or Chinese boys of perhaps twice their age, was foregone from the first; from the first it had never been a question of constitutions or treaties, but one of the requirements of society.

As such it should have been treated from the first. A dozen words of cool and candid explanation would have settled the matter, and all the rumpus that has been raised over "broken treaties" and the "hoodlumism" of San Francisco would have been avoided.

If Japan for reasons of her own wants a war

with the United States, she ought to find something like a semblance of a reason for declaring it, and not out of nothing bring down upon California the complaints of an impetuous President, and the anathemas of a powerful if ignorant press.

In considering whether Japan wants a clash with the United States, we must first ask what possible motive could prompt such a desire? Well, most wars in the world have been sprung either through a desire to control trade or for loot or through lust for more territory. When our great Civil war was on, there were plenty of men in England, some of them clergymen, who insisted that Great Britain would have a right to interfere and help crush the United States for no other purpose than to hopelessly cripple a dangerous commercial rival. Great Britain is in close alliance with Japan. Japan is overcrowded; she wants more territory. So long as the Monroe doctrine is adhered to the country south of us cannot be attacked. The Panama canal will be finished after awhile, which will greatly add to the defensive power of the United States. Japan is rushing the building of her navy. She keeps a million of men trained on land. Suppose she were meditating a war five years hence, would she not be doing just what she is now doing—rushing her people in California, Oregon and Washington, having her great soldiers and sailors coming with honeyed words, declaring that her only desire is for peace and closer commercial relations; that war with the United States is a thought unspeakable, but at the same time forever complaining if a row breaks out among Americans in a Japanese restaurant in San Francisco, and protesting if the people of that city do not want grown Japanese to occupy the same seats in school with their little girls; and keeping the home press inflaming the people with their surly charges that their people are being abused in the United States? This may be but an idle and unjust suspicion, but the United States Congress will be derelict in duty if it does not rush the building of a navy and keep out standing offers of premiums for improved explosives and guns.

Not Quite Yet.

In the Homiletic Review is a strong article from the pen of Dr. Lyman Abbott, which is headed "Christ's Programme for The Hague Conference." We have not seen the entire article—only some extracts in exchanges.

The eminent divine says what is needed is for the nations to adopt the formula laid down by the Savior, which he puts out in these words:

"If you have a difficulty with your neighbor, first try to settle it by diplomatic, friendly conference. If you cannot do it that way, get two or three other men and see if through their intervention the matter cannot be settled. If not, then appeal to the community and let them settle it, and if your opponent will not accept your decision, then have nothing more to do with him."

That is good New Testament doctrine, but the course marked out would have its difficulties when it came to enforcing it, though Dr. Abbott declares it is Christ's plan. He explains the plan this way:

If a nation says, after a decision, "We won't accept this decision," all that is necessary will be to say: "Very well, we won't take your imports, we won't send you our exports, we won't allow your people to come here, we won't have anything to do with you. We will treat you as though you were on another planet." No nation could stand apart from any other nation. No army, no navy, no executive of the sword and scabbard would be required.

It is queer how learned people in the pursuit of a hobby will forget or ignore palpable facts. The position which Dr. Abbott would have nations assume, in case some other nation should